



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/720,129

11/25/2003

Hidehiko Fujiwara

040447-0255

4405

22428 7590 06/30/2008

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP  
SUITE 500  
3000 K STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

COLIN, CARL G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2136

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/30/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/720,129	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FUJIWARA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CARL COLIN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/21/2008 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. In communications filed on 5/21/2008, Applicant amends claim 1. The following claims 1-16 are presented for examination.

2.1 Applicant's arguments, pages 6-10, filed on 5/21/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to claim 1, Applicant argues "*Russ does not teach communications between two slave units such that one slave unit is protected by a firewall and another is not.*" Examiner respectfully disagrees as Russ discloses "a DSCT which acts as a proxy for the client-receiver and in that case the headend transmits service instances and messages to the DSCT which then processes the service instances before re-transmitting them to the client-receiver" (see paragraph 46) and the proxy decides whether it is safe to let

Art Unit: 2136

traffic pass through to the client-receiver (see paragraph 132) that meets the recitation of intranet with firewall (see figure 1). As shown above the DSCT has firewall capability.

In response to applicant that Russ does not teach the wherein clause of claim 1. Examiner respectfully disagrees as Russ teaches communication section DSCT, a slave unit in the Intranet such as 122 in fig. 1 and a slave unit outside the firewall such as content provider and head end (see page 3, paragraphs 32 and 35).

With respect to claims 3-4 and claims 11-13, in response to applicant about Examiner's official notice, it is noted that page 5, lines 8-11 was not cited by the Examiner. Prior art is provided for support; for instance, Smith et al 6,502,191 teaches basic concepts of firewall that includes blocking information transfer from Intranet to the Internet (see column 1, lines 34-38). It is implicit and within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art that not all devices on the Internet are adapted to encryption. Use of HTTP is to allow such communications to exist with these types of devices. In response to applicant's arguments about Smith not teaching the claimed limitation of the dependent claims, Smith et al further teaches a proxy server and/or delivery server (agency communication section) that executes communications without encryption or inhibits communications when an access is made from a computer in the Intranet protecting by a firewall to a receiving device (other internet server, fax machine, printer...) which is located outside the firewall and is not adapted for encryption (see column 1, lines 58-63 and column 2, lines 5-35). Therefore, applicant has not overcome the obviousness rejection of claims 3-4 and 11-13. Applicant further argues that Smith teaches a proxy or firewall (see Smith, abstract and column 4, lines 15-20, disclosing proxy and firewalls)

Regarding claims 8-10, applicant presents the same arguments as claim 1 with respect to Vassilovski therefore, claims 8-10 are maintained for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Upon further consideration, the rejection of claims 1-16 is set forth below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-7 and 11-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2003/0219127 to **Russ et al** in view of US Patent 6,502,191 to **Smith et al**.

As per claim 1, **Russ et al** discloses a system for executing communications, the system comprises: **Russ et al** discloses DSCT may be acting as a proxy or gateway for the client-receiver 122 and providing access control (see page 5, paragraph 46 see also paragraph 71 and fig. 3) that meets the recitation of *at least one slave unit in an intranet protected by a firewall*. **Russ et al** discloses headend 102 and service providers (see paragraphs 32 and 35 and fig.1 that

Art Unit: 2136

meets the recitation of *at least one slave unit outside the firewall*. **Russ et al** discloses *an agency communication section (i.e. DSCT) equipped to the intranet (see figure 1) for executing encryption or decryption by agency (see page 5, paragraph 46) for a slave unit (client-receiver 122) having no mechanism (no secure element) for encryption in the intranet (see page 15, paragraph 145)*, wherein the system executes communications between a slave unit (client-receiver 122) in the intranet protected by the firewall (DSCT has firewall capability) and another slave unit (headend 102 and service providers) located outside the firewall through the Internet (see paragraph 132). As interpreted by Examiner, the DSCT performs role of filtering traffic from and to the client-receiver which is broadly and reasonably interpreted as a firewall.

Firewall protection is also very well known in the art as disclosed by **Smith et al**. **Smith et al** in an analogous art teaches communication between a computer inside an intranet protected by a firewall and a server outside the firewall wherein the system executes communications between a slave unit in an intranet protected by a firewall and another slave unit located outside the firewall through the Internet (see column 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to establish a system protected by firewall so as to regulate traffic coming in and out of the firewall as suggested by **Smith et al** (see column 2, lines 5-35).

As per claim 2, **Russ et al** discloses DSCT may be acting as a proxy for the client-receiver and access control (see page 5, paragraph 46 see also paragraph 71 and fig. 3) that meets the recitation of intranet with a firewall. **Russ et al** further discloses wherein said agency communication section (i.e. DSCT) executes the communications without encryption, when an

access is made from a slave unit which is located outside the firewall and is not adapted to encryption (see page 10, paragraph 92).

As per claims 3-4, **Russ et al** substantially discloses the DSCT is adapted to determine whether communication should be encrypted or not and wherein said agency communication section executes communications without encryption or inhibits communications, when an access is made from a slave unit inside the firewall to a terminal (head end) which is located outside the firewall (see page 11, paragraph 103 and page 5, paragraph 46, sentence before last). **Russ et al** is silent about the terminal outside the firewall is not adapted to encryption, but discloses in an embodiment that encryption is not necessary for terminal inside the firewall since it is not adapted to encryption. Therefore, it would have only required routine skill in the art and design choice to have the client-receiver (i.e. laptop) communicating with a terminal not adapted to encryption because **Russ et al** suggests different non-limiting factors for determining whether encryption and decryption should be carried by DSCT and this will not depart from the spirit and scope of the invention disclosed by Russ et al (see page 11, paragraph 107 and page 15, paragraph 145). **Smith et al** further teaches a proxy server and/or delivery server (agency communication section) that executes communications without encryption (such as HTTP) or inhibits communications when an access is made from a computer in the Intranet protecting by a firewall to a receiving device (other internet server, fax machine, printer...) which is located outside the firewall and is not adapted for encryption (see column 1, lines 58-63 and column 2, lines 5-35). Therefore, claims 3-4 are also rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claims 5-7, **Russ et al** discloses wherein said agency communication section has a virtual slave unit having the function of the slave unit and a function of converting voice and data formats to go beyond the firewall, and said virtual slave unit executes communications by agency (see page 4, paragraph 37 and page 12, paragraph 116).

As per claims 11-13, the references as combined above disclose wherein the communications between a slave unit inside the intranet and a slave unit on the Internet are executed through an HTTP port of the firewall (see **Smith et al**, column 2, lines 25-35). Therefore, claims 11-13 are also rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claims 14-16, **Russ et al** discloses wherein a slave unit having a mechanism for encryption is used, and said slave unit has means for judging whether said slave unit is located inside or outside the firewall, said slave unit executing encryption if it is judged by said means that said slave unit is located outside the firewall or stopping the encryption function if it is judged by said means that said slave unit is located inside the firewall (see page 9-10, paragraphs 90-92).

4. **Claims 8-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2003/0219127 to **Russ et al** in view of US Patent 6,502,191 to **Smith et al** as applied to claims 1-7 and further in view of US Patent 6,813,264 to **Vassilovski**.



As per claims 8-10, **Russ et al** substantially discloses wherein said agency communication section analyzes encrypted data, and executes the communications to a Web server or a slave unit in the intranet on the basis of the judgment result (see page 10, paragraph 92). **Russ et al** does not explicitly disclose judging whether the encrypted data indicates a Web access or encrypted private branch IP telephone communication, but suggests any type of communication protocol (see page 2, paragraph 24). **Vassilovski** in an analogous art teaches determining whether encrypted data should be routed to VOIP or PSTN and executes the communications to a Web server or a slave unit on the basis of the judgment result that meets the recitation of wherein said agency communication section analyzes the encrypted data to judge whether the encrypted data indicates a Web access or encrypted private branch IP telephone communication, and executes the communications to a Web server or a slave unit in the intranet on the basis of the judgment result (see abstract and figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system as combined above to include judging for data such as web access or IP telephone communication and executes the communications to a Web server or a slave unit in the intranet on the basis of the judgment result because it would direct communications to the right service according to user registration and entitlement to the service as suggested by **Vassilovski** (see column 2, line 35 through column 3, line 23).

***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as the prior art discloses communications between devices protected by a firewall and devices located outside the firewall. (See PTO-form 892).

5.1 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CARL COLIN whose telephone number is (571)272-3862. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser G. Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Carl Colin/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2136

June 22, 2008